

What a sad irony in history it would be for the United States today to see a dictator in Tehran join league with the oppressive dictator Mr. Chavez in Venezuela to potentially place nuclear devices within America's borders.

I think we should look back to what President Kennedy talked about when he addressed the Cuban missile crisis in order to steel ourselves for the struggles ahead. President Kennedy pointed out that America does not keep its word only when it is easy. America does not keep its word only when it is easy. And while the price of freedom is always high, Americans have always paid it.

I am convinced that if we learn from the lessons of histories and from the successes of individuals like President Kennedy, from his commitment to defending this Nation, to the expansion of liberty, we ourselves will see the day where both Cuba and Venezuela and the people of Iran are free.

Mr. WAMP. I thank the gentleman, and in closing, let me say this. I am not the most partisan person here at all. As a matter of fact, I don't think either party has an exclusive on integrity or ideas. I grew up a Democrat, and now I'm a Republican.

Argue with us about the role of the Federal Government in education and whether it is best at the local level, the State level or Federal level. Argue with us whether the health care system should be turned over to the government or private.

But don't argue with us whether we are fighting these threats of global jihadism and whether we unite anymore at the water's edge in defense of liberty. Don't argue with us on that. Join us. Be patriotic and honor the sacrifice and the legacy of the Greatest Generation.

THE NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REICHERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to address the House once again. I would like to thank the Democratic leadership for allowing us to have this hour, the 30-something Working Group. We come to the floor for the second time tonight to share the new direction for America.

There is great reason to promote a new direction for America, especially as it relates to our actions near the U.S. House of Representatives.

I don't want to take any great deal of responsibility for what is said or what is done in the White House, because I am a Member of Congress, and Article I, section 1 authorizes us to take legislative action. Also within our rules and the spirit of our rules is to have a level of oversight and also investigative powers here in the House.

There are a number of things that are taking place in our country that

have been pushed forth or have been rubber-stamped by this House out of the administration that should not be, and we want to make sure as we start talking about our new direction for America, especially on the Democratic side of the aisle, that if we are in control we look forward to working in a bipartisan way, making sure that Republicans who do want to be a part of this new direction can definitely participate in that process if it is within the spirit of making sure that we have real security here, here in the United States as it relates to implementing the 9/11 Commission recommendations.

□ 1915

Also, making sure that we have better pay for jobs that American workers carry out day in and day out. The minimum wage has not been increased through this Congress and through the White House since 1997. It is very unfortunate that we do have some Members on the other side of the aisle that are willing to vote for pay increases to Members of Congress, including Senators, but not pay increases or a minimum wage increase for the American people, which we have said on this side of the aisle that one of the first actions of the Congress, of the Democratic Congress, would be to make sure that we move the minimum wage to \$7.25.

Making sure that we deal with the cost of the increased college tuition that has been brought about through this rubber-stamp Republican majority. We are willing to reverse that and make sure that we give tax deductions to those that want to educate themselves and those family members who want to assist in that process, making sure that we expand Pell Grants. A lot of promises were made right up here at this podium just below your podium there, Mr. Speaker, the President made as it relates to the expansion of Pell Grants, and that has not happened. It has decreased in many ways.

Energy independence. It is important that we do this. Just today I was watching the evening news talk about how some billionaires in other parts of the world and here have invested in an initiative of the Clinton Foundation as it relates to making us energy independent. Some \$10 billion of the president and CEO of Virgin Airlines has put in over the next 4 or 5 years to make sure we can look for alternative fuels. These are private citizens that are now stepping up to try to look for alternative fuels because they have seen what it has done to the United States of America.

Since the Congress does not want to rein in big oil companies and wants to have a special relationship with big oil companies where they receive more subsidies than they will ever receive in the history of the Republic, and also higher profits and the highest profits that they have ever experienced in the history of the world, leave alone the United States of America, and still there is no legislation that is really

promoting alternative fuels through this House.

We are dedicated and committed to making sure that not only the research, but making sure the access for E85, using coal and other alternative fuel initiatives, to make sure that we invest in the Midwest versus the Middle East. And what is happening right now, the Republican Congress is voting to invest in the Middle East versus the Midwest.

Making sure that health care is affordable for every American. I think that is very, very important. Some people may say, well, Congressman, you are talking about individuals. We are not talking about individuals. We are talking about small business having an opportunity to provide health care for their employees. We are talking about companies as big as Ford having a plan to lay off or a plan to have early retirement for many of their employees, mainly because of health care costs, of what it is costing big companies here in the U.S. and small companies as they go to provide opportunities for their workers.

And looking at the issue of balancing the budget, I think that is very, very important as relates to bringing this out-of-control spending and borrowing Congress. The Republican majority has borrowed more money from foreign nations in 4 years than in the history of this country. No other time, 224 years prior to this Republican administration that we have now and the rubber-stamp Republican majority that we have here in the House, no other time in the history of the country, this is not our numbers, these are the numbers of the U.S. Department of Treasury, that we see that kind of activity taking place.

We are the only party, Mr. Speaker, I must add here, in this House that has actually balanced the budget. Other people can talk about it. We have actually done it. If there was a job interview, and the Republican Conference versus Democratic Caucus and individuals talk about balancing the budget, the qualifications are clear that here on this side of the aisle, without one Republican vote, I do not like to say that, but without one Republican vote, that we balanced the budget. It is what it is. It is history, and it could be the future as it relates to this House if allowed to lead this House by the American people.

Also, when we look at the Social Security, we talked about this in our last hour. There are a number of Republicans and also the President has just said if he gets the kind of rubber-stamp Congress he has right now, he is going to continue to celebrate in moving towards the area of privatization, privatizing Social Security. That is not what I am saying. That is what the President has said. So I think it is important for people to understand that.

On this side of the aisle, there was about 1,000 town hall meetings that took place in districts throughout the

country, and we went to other parts of this country to have town hall meetings where other Members would not have town hall meetings on this issue, along with a coalition of a number of groups that were out there that were concerned about Social Security not only for seniors, but also making sure that we have survivor benefits for those that have passed. They had paid into Social Security so that their family members would be able to educate themselves, and those individuals that were on the job and all of the sudden were injured on the job, regardless of what the benefits of the job, Social Security was there to give a little bit towards making their lives somewhat livable.

And through the privatization scheme that Republican majority, rubber stamp, along with the President of the United States, who flew all around the country and tried to sell, and the American people still said no, taking us through that process all over again versus trying to balance the budget and go back to the years when the Democrats were in control. We actually balanced the budget, and we saw surpluses as far as the eye can see and a healthy future for the Social Security Trust Fund. That is not Democratic talk. That is American talk. And guess what? It is action, and it was action.

What we are hearing now is a lot of we want to cut it in half, we think we are going to cut the budget in half, we believe that we are going to do the better job versus the other person. I mean, you can talk about the issues.

You want to talk about border security, Mr. Speaker, Republican majority, we can talk about it. They said the American people are fed up. Well, how did they get fed up? And how do we get to the point that they got up to 80 or 90 percent of some of the things I heard here on this floor today; how did they get there?

I guess some members of the Republican majority come and say, well, it is the Democrats' fault. We are in the minority. We do not have the power to bring legislation to the floor, to be able to have real border security, because if we had the power, Mr. Speaker, when the 9/11 Commission report and recommendations were sent to this House and to this Congress and to this White House, we would have 6,000-plus more border agents right now on the border. We would have a real strategy. Maybe we would save \$429 million that was wasted in monitoring the border in cost overruns and scandals that the inspector general, Department of Homeland Security, has identified. I am talking fact, not fiction. Maybe, just maybe, the new plan that has just been released to a U.S. company for \$2.5 billion would have the oversight that they have and also have agents that can respond to monitoring our borders. I mean, we are understaffed as it relates to law enforcement on the border.

Meanwhile, the Republican Congress wants to do everything that they have

done thus far and passing responsibility and unfunded mandates to the State and also to local parishes and counties and cities to say that, oh, yeah, we will give you the authority to carry out our function. Meanwhile, while the police officer and the first responder, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I was once a upon a time in life as a State trooper. Goodness, we had enough to deal with not only enforcing the laws of the State of Florida and local ordinances there, but at the same time now I have got to become a border agent because the Republican Congress decided to shortchange me, but allow these big companies to run away with the lack of oversight.

The headlines of the Department of Homeland Security is not today, Mr. Speaker, about how secure in America. It is about how someone ran off with a contract, how we overspent as it relates to Katrina contracts, how we continue to have overspending and lack of accountability in the war in Iraq.

All of these issues, the cost overruns, I went over to the Department of Defense. There is a lot of stuff over there, but I am saying cost overruns and the lack of oversight as it relates to the Department of Homeland Security, and I am a member of the committee, trying to bring about change, but guess what? I am in the minority. The only thing I can change here is that the Members, I am almost done, Mr. Speaker, in trying to encourage the Republican majority to see the light, like the 9/11 Commission and first responders throughout this country have seen the light and survivors of 9/11 families have seen the light, of saying just do what we have laid out, the work product from the 9/11 Commission.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, this is what it comes down to here. Here is the war in Iraq costs, okay? So when you are talking about whether it is homeland security, whether it is the cargo or whether it is the planes, whether it is the first responders, whether it is the kind of technology that we need, all of these other issues, here are the costs, Mr. Speaker: \$8.4 billion per month we are spending in Iraq; \$1.9 billion per week in Iraq; \$275 million per day; and \$11.5 million per hour.

So when you are looking at what we need to spend on and what the costs are here, whether you are a Democrat or you are a Republican, Mr. Speaker, we can agree that this money that has been spent to the tune of \$400 billion, and when you look at the projection for war spending in Iraq over the next few years, when you look at what we are going to spend and you look at the situation that we are in while we are in Iraq right now, we are in the middle of a civil war. So we are basically dumping good money after bad, getting misinformation from the administration.

Here are the projected costs for the growing cost in Iraq in billions of dollars, and we see in the blue over there about \$318 billion, getting close to \$400

billion. And you look at the projection out into the future, talking about \$500- or \$600 billion, getting close to \$1 trillion we are going to spend in Iraq, Mr. Speaker.

When you look at the cuts that are going on here at home, when you look at the lack of investment here at home, we can all say that what value are we getting from this investment into Iraq, which are in the middle of a civil war? We have ethnic groups fighting with each other, with the United States in the middle. The number of terrorists are going up. The number of incidents in regards to American soldiers and international forces and Iraqi troops there, all going up.

This is not getting better, it is getting worse, and we have some 84 or 85 former members of the national security saying that we are losing the war in Iraq. We are certainly not winning it. It is time for us to reevaluate, and I think Mr. MEEK and myself and Mr. MURTHA and Mr. SKELTON and the members of the Armed Services Committee are saying let us have some oversight. Let us have real hearings, because how can you have the Secretary of Defense, who is in charge of this whole operation, still be in place, failure after failure, bad intelligence, bad information, lack of a plan, and at the end of the day, you may be able to accept all that, but 2 weeks ago, about a week and a half, 2 weeks ago, when it all came out that the Secretary of Defense was quoted as saying that he would fire, Mr. Speaker, the next person who asked him when are we going to come up with a postwar plan, when are we going to come up with a postwar plan. And one of the main provisions for going to war is how are we going to get in, what is the strategy, and the most important question, how are we going to get out.

This Secretary of Defense said he does not have a plan to get out, and the next person that asks him in his inner circle about having a plan, they are going to be fired. Now, that is not leadership.

Then we get caught in these situations, and we have, it is like if something is going wrong, we have to get a new banner we put out and a new slogan that we put out and mission accomplished. That is unfair to the American people.

□ 1930

Because the lack of oversight, the lack of review, the lack of account. And it is amazing to see how poorly this has been executed and no one has been fired. Nobody has been fired.

And so we call upon the Republican Congress to execute their constitutional obligations, Article I, section 1 of the Constitution that creates this body we think needs to provide the kind of oversight. And it is not a coincidence. No one can be appointed to this body. You have to run. You have to be directly elected to this body. If something happens to a Senator, they

resign, they pass away, a Governor can appoint. You can't get appointed to the House of Representatives, Mr. MEEK. You have got to run; you have got to get elected.

And so the costs are there, Mr. Speaker. All those billions of dollars. And when you compare those costs to what we could spend that money on here in the United States, it is baffling, it is mind-boggling.

Mr. MEEK mentioned the Homeland Security Department, \$33 billion for a year. That could be paid for, our homeland security budget could be paid for with 4 months of spending in Iraq. How about equipping commercial airlines with the proper defenses against shoulder-fired missiles? \$10 billion. That could be paid for by 5 weeks in Iraq. And on and on and on.

Now, a lot of our cities, I represent Youngstown, Ohio; Akron, Ohio; Warren, Ohio. A lot of the issues we face back home are the issues of cops and making sure we have police on the beat. And a lot of these local communities, very poor, they don't have the necessary resources, Mr. MEEK, to fund the police and fire. There are always levies going on the ballot getting shot down. We could double the COPS program which provides community policing grants. We could double the COPS program, \$1.4 billion a year with 5 days in Iraq.

So you want to talk about homeland security? You want to talk about making our neighborhoods safe? Just a few weeks in Iraq, we could be able to fund this program.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you, Mr. RYAN. The COPS program is something that the Association of Police Chiefs wants; it is what the Association of Sheriffs wants. It is something that local communities, Mr. Speaker, they want it. The cops support community-oriented policing support from the U.S. Congress.

Now, if 20 percent or 10 percent of that funding is in place, it would be shocking, and it is not there. As a matter of fact, in many areas it has been zeroed out. And so this is where people get an opportunity to see its government at work: bike patrols, preventing crime before it happens. I think it is very, very important.

Mr. RYAN, because we believe in third-party validators in the 30-something Working Group, I just wanted to take out the Washington Times, by no stretch of the imagination the liberal paper, because as the Republican majority always talks about, you know, when I was in Florida, they had this caucus called the Freedom Caucus, and they wanted to be conservatives.

But I just wanted to say that I think it is important that we bring third-party validators, not just fiction, but third-party validators. The Washington Times. It is an article, I guess Members can go online, July 9 of 2006. I take this stuff and I read it, and I make sure that we get it to be able to bring out in such a time as this.

Here is an article right here: "Social Security Battle." The President is quoted here saying: "If I get a Republican Congress," okay, "I am going to rekindle the fight to privatize Social Security." He says it right here. I didn't go in the back and print this up. He says it right here. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is important that we identify those issues and that we bring it to the floor and we also share with the American people.

I guarantee you, there is not one Member of the Republican conference that is going home that is having a town hall meeting, because very few took place, as it relates to the privatization of Social Security, since it was so unpopular. I guarantee you, while we all go back to our districts and ask our constituents for their vote and for their vote of confidence, that nowhere in campaign literature that may be printed are we saying, I support the President in privatizing Social Security.

Well, you know why that is not the case, Mr. Speaker? It is because it is so unpopular, because the only people that have a guaranteed benefit in a Social Security privatization plan is Wall Street, over \$535-plus billion. I believe the GAO just came out with a report recently. And also I stand here, Mr. Speaker, I mean, we come to the floor to do business. We don't come to the floor to play around and whatever, picking things out of the sky saying that we believe or are using fiction and all. Here is something right here. Members can go on WWW.house.gov/waysandmeans—democrats where you can get this report here of "Social Security Privatization, A Continuing Threat." And it quotes the Governmental Accountability Office and what they found. And here is a copy of the GAO report, just a summary right here, just some points, confirming that the impact of the Bush plan would result in a benefit cut. And I think it is very, very important that people understand that and that you understand that benefits will be cut.

We had some folks here on this floor, Mr. Speaker, it happened in 109th Congress, all of us here in this Chamber right now. And those Members in their offices know full well that people came here to the floor and said, you will not experience a benefit cut.

It is not about the special interests getting what they want, Mr. Speaker. It is about the American people getting what they need and what they deserve. Because special interests is not paying into Social Security, when you look at what the average American has to pay into Social Security. And then we are going to privatize it so that others can benefit off of social security benefits for the American people?

If you drive an F-10 or you drive a flex vehicle, this is your issue. If you are an American worker and you got injured on the job and you are on disability, this is your issue. If you are a retired American or coming close to re-

tirement, even though you may have a pension or a 401(k), this is your issue.

Because this is what the Federal Government has said, that we have your back on Social Security. When all else fails, when Enrons of the world take place and when all these kinds of things take place where people thought that they were going to have something and they don't necessarily have it the way they thought they were going to have it, one thing that they can count on, Mr. Speaker, and that is Social Security. One thing that they can count on.

So when we start talking about privatizing Social Security, there were going to be some very happy special interest folk that for Medicare thought that they were going to be able to bank in on the sweat and sacrifice of American workers and taking that Social Security benefit and put it into some sort of stock exchange scheme, and to say that, oh, we are going to let everyone have their own students. And they really went after young people.

And I want to commend a number of people that need to be: Rock the Vote, and different coalitions that were out there that worked so very, very hard. And the 30-something Working Group, Mr. Speaker, we came to this floor night after night and day after day commending those organizations, as we moved down the line. The AARP and a number of other groups were out there against this.

And, now, for the President, after being defeated by the American people and by the Democratic minority, I must add, here in this House, by defeating the Republican majority that was willing to walk in lock step and rubber-stamping what this Republican President, and regardless if it is a Republican or Democratic President, there is something fundamentally wrong when you have a President that can say yes in the Oval Office. And that the U.S. Congress, forget about Article I, section 1 of the U.S. Constitution, forget about what is here.

The President can say, yeah, we can do it. Just like Vice President CHENEY and his aides had the conversation with Big Oil executives in the White House who cut a deal on energy in 2001, gave them a head nod there in the White House, and then came to Capitol Hill and got exactly what they wanted that then turned around in record-breaking profits, oil companies. Here it is right here, Mr. Speaker. Like I said, we come to the floor to carry out business on behalf of the American people. We don't come here, somebody hand us a sheet and say you start reading this, this is what we want you to read.

Look at these profits. A meeting happens in the White House. I know I have my article here somewhere, and I will pick up the article on the back end of this chart. It happens in 2001. In 2002, \$34 billion in profits for Big Oil companies. 2003, \$59 billion. 2004, \$84 billion in profits. Record-breaking. 2005, \$113 billion in profits, and climbing, Mr. Speaker.

Profits, Mr. RYAN and I always say, is not a dirty word. But let me tell you what makes it disgraceful, dirty and unclear, if I can double describe things here, is the fact that the American people at the same time these profits were taking place were paying through the nose, and still in my opinion paying through the nose, for overpriced fuel and for overpriced gas here in the United States, need it be heating oil, need it be diesel or what have you. And the American public is paying for this because now trucking companies have a fuel surcharge on it, and so not only are you paying at the pump, you are paying at the grocery store and you are paying at the department stores.

Again, third-party validator, and I am going to yield over to Mr. RYAN here in a minute, is the fact that we have the White House documents. Here is a Washington Post story, 2005, November 16, front-page article. This is the kind of stuff you save, Mr. Speaker. You don't like, oh, read it and then put it somewhere off to the side in the recycling bin and let it go. You keep this because you want to remind your colleagues on the other side of the aisle that you know exactly what they are doing to the American people:

"White House documents shows that executives from Big Oil companies met with Vice President CHENEY's Energy Task Force in 2001," it goes back to the chart that I just identified here, "something long suspected by environmentalists but denied as recently as last week by industry executives testifying before Congress."

That is okay if the Congress doesn't want to hold their feet to the fire and hold them in contempt, but folks thought they were going to jail. And these are our constituents that are paying through the nose. Meanwhile, we are letting them out the door.

The document obtained by The Washington Post shows that officials from ExxonMobil Corp., also Shell Oil Company, BP of America met in the White House complex with Cheney aides who were developing national energy policy, parts of which became law, parts that are still being debated here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I rest my case. I don't need to come up with any slick slogans. I don't need to talk to anyone about what will sound good on the floor. I don't need to do that. I can walk through these Halls of Congress with great confidence. I sleep well at night because I know we are here saying we are willing to put this country in a new direction, we are willing to deal with real energy-efficient ways of dealing with fuel and alternative fuels.

Last point, Mr. RYAN. This is what happens when you have a rubber-stamp Congress and special interests that reach right into the legislative process here, or the lack thereof. Here is ExxonMobil. I didn't do this; this is what they have done.

You have the regular, special, super plus. You have got a couple of prices

there. Here is the E-85 here. Here is the little sticker that is on the pump: "Cannot use your Mobil credit card." I am even going to say, "Non-Mobil product." Some might say, well, if we just put "cannot use your Mobil credit card" and leave that "non-Mobil product" off, then someone may say, well, that is a little bit too unfair. But I think it is important as we look at this, if you can walk into a Mobil station and buy a bag of chips or a carton of cigarettes or 10 gallons of milk with your Mobil credit card, which you can do, then why can't you buy E-85, an alternative fuel that is going to help us continue to invest in the Midwest versus the Middle East and help us towards energy independence? Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I want to thank Mr. MEEK.

There is no question about it, Mr. MEEK. And whether you are dealing with the environment, whether you are dealing with the oil industry, the energy industry, whether you are talking about the pharmaceutical industry, you have got it. And I think Mr. Gingrich has said it best.

And we are joined with a guest here, a special guest for the 30-somethings. And I just want to share, Madam Leader, real briefly, on July 13 what even Newt Gingrich is saying, the third-party validator, Mr. Speaker, about lack of leadership here in the United States Congress.

□ 1945

He said, "When facing a crisis at home and abroad, it is important to have an informed independent legislative branch," created by Article I, section 1 of the Constitution, "coming to grips with this reality and not sitting around waiting for Presidential leadership."

It is time for this body to step up and start leading. And with that I yield to our fearless leader, Ms. PELOSI from California.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank you, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MEEK from Florida and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, the cochairs of our 30-something Working Group, for the boundless energy that you have expended, the tremendous intellect and the great commitment to a new direction and a better future.

Our 30-something Working Group has been an inspiration to Congress and invigoration to us all, and I join as a mother of 30-somethings, and in thanking you for what you have done.

It is appropriate that the 30-something Group is advocating advancing in a new direction because this new direction is absolutely essential for young people in our country. Our 30-somethings are committed to a better future for all Americans. So is our new direction, a new direction for all Americans, not just the privileged few.

We can begin with our Six for '06, to make America safer. We will begin by passing the 9/11 Commission recommendations. We have just observed

the fifth anniversary of 9/11. Here we are 5 years after 9/11. The Commission is giving the Federal Government Ds and Fs and incompletes for implementation of their recommendations. The first day of Congress we will pass the 9/11 Commission recommendations and make America safer.

We will make our economy fairer, and we will begin by passing the minimum wage. We can do it next week. The bill is in the hopper. To make our economy fair, we can pass the minimum wage, and certainly not have Congress have any increase in its salary until there is an increase and unless there is an increase in the minimum wage.

We can also remove the incentives for companies to send jobs overseas. Imagine taxpayers are giving incentives for companies to send job overseas. We will end that.

We will make colleges more affordable. It is important to broaden the opportunity for a college education, and we will begin by making college tuition tax deductible and cutting in half the interest on student loans.

We will make health care more affordable, and we will begin by allowing the government to negotiate for lower prices for prescription drugs.

And we will promote stem cell research. That is better for a healthy America.

We will move towards energy independence that our colleagues were talking about here. We will begin by repealing the subsidies that have been given to big oil and big energy companies, and instead use that \$18 billion for research in alternative energy resources.

Every day that we are here, we will work for a dignified retirement by preserving Social Security, protecting pensions and encouraging savings for America's seniors. This we will do within the first 100 hours of a new Congress, given the opportunity. But we could do it now even before Congress leaves. Instead, we have a do-nothing, rubber-stamp Congress.

I see the rubber stamp here. Here we are just a few days from the end of the fiscal year, and this Congress has still not passed the budget for this fiscal year. How could it be, a week before the end of the fiscal year, and this do-nothing Congress has not even passed the budget?

In addition, we have a crying need in our country for comprehensive, bipartisan immigration reform. We certainly are not moving in any direction to make that possible.

The list goes on. We haven't finished our appropriations bills. We shouldn't leave here until we have an increase in the minimum wage.

But when we return, and hopefully with a verdict from the American people, we will get about the people's business, the issues that are relevant to the lives of the American people, their jobs, their health care, their economic security, the health care for their families, the education of their children,

safe America, safe neighborhoods and a secure America with energy independence.

We will do all of this from the very first day with integrity. Our first rule that Members will vote on will be for integrity, to sever the link between special interests and legislation so that we are here for the people's interest instead. With civility, with bipartisan administration of the House so that every voice in the country is heard, not only the voices of those who happen to have their Member be in the majority; and we will do it with fiscal discipline. No more deficit spending. Pay as you go, audit the books, account for the money to the American people.

All of this is possible because of the energy and enthusiasm of our 30-somethings, Mr. RYAN, Mr. MEEK, and Ms. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and all of the other 30-something members who have participated here on the floor of the House and throughout the country to talk about a new direction.

The American people are an optimistic, confident, hopeful lot, and we build on that spirit, American spirit, as we go forth with an optimism into these elections, an optimism about a better future. We owe it to our troops who work to protect us. We owe it to our Founders and the vision they had for America, and we owe it to our children.

With that, I yield back with all of the compliments in the world to these two distinguished gentlemen for bringing the idea of a rubber-stamp Congress to the floor here. It is a fact of life on the floor of Congress, and they are pointing that out to the American people, but not without a spirit of optimism about change. Change is necessary, change is possible, and it will happen because of the leadership of the Congressman TIM RYAN and Congressman KENDRICK MEEK. Thank you so much.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you so much. It is an honor to have you down here with us. We come here a lot, and to be graced with your presence, I think it is important what the leader said about what we can do not within the first 100 days, but within the first 100 hours. They are some very basic, simple steps.

We talk about just the average person, what changes will happen in their own lives if their student loan rates are cut in half and the minimum wage is raised within the first 100 hours. That is a significant impact on people around the country.

It is not that we are going to wave some magic wand, but we are going to do the people's business. With the gentlewoman's leadership, it is going to be an exciting time.

Mr. Speaker, you see excitement among Democrats about some alternatives. We have some challenges, but any time you challenge the American people, they seem to step up. I know Ms. PELOSI will provide us with that leadership.

Ms. PELOSI. I think the American people are way ahead of this Congress,

and they are waiting for us to catch up. We look forward to that with your full participation. Thank you very much.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you very much, Madam Leader, for coming down. You definitely cement what we have been talking about for 3 years on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, we had it from the top person. If we have an opportunity to lead this House, and we sure hope that we will have that opportunity, you heard it from the person who will drive the agenda and make sure that we are able to do what we have to do.

Leader, I want to thank you for having confidence in those of us who are young Members here in this House to be able to carry the message, to carry the fight to stop Social Security from being privatized. We have an article in the Washington Times that talks about the fact that if the Republican majority is back after the elections, that the President feels that he has the support here in the House to privatize Social Security, and they may very well do it.

I want to thank you for allowing us to come to this floor and share with the Members our plans and alternatives, and make sure that they know full well that we are ready to move in a new direction.

One thing that I mention all the time, and you mentioned in your comments, bipartisanship can only be allowed if the majority allows it. I personally appreciate as a Member who has spent 8 years in the State legislature and has worked in the Florida Senate in a bipartisan way, a lot can be accomplished on then the State and now this country. And I know if we are allowed to lead with that philosophy, America's agenda will move forward.

Like the leader said, the American people are far ahead of us. We are trying to catch up with them. We are saying that we have the will and the desire to do so. Thank you for coming here.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank you again for your leadership in the fight to preserve Social Security, to stop the privatization, to stop the raid on the trust fund, and to stop the reduction in benefits. Without the participation of the 30-somethings, we would not have been as successful as we were.

But the threat still looms. The President and the leadership of this House talks about it, and the leadership of the Republican Party nationally talks about it, and the President's staff also talks about it. This is something that is an ongoing fight. With you in the forefront, with you as a voice for your generation, and as a voice for our country, that we will prevail. Thank you.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you.

Mr. RYAN, I look forward to continuing, until the clock runs out on this Congress, to continue to come down to the floor to share with the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we can't get any higher than where we are right now as it relates to the commitment and the will and the desire to put America in a new direction.

Mr. RYAN, I think with the leader coming down to the House, to this floor a few minutes before 8:00, 8 p.m. eastern standard time after a full day of legislative session, she has pretty much laid it out as relates to the Democratic plan, put this country in a new direction and have real security. Forget about the first 100 days, like a lot of politicians like to talk about; the first 100 hours of a Democratic Congress and all of the things that she identified.

I am willing to yield to Mr. RYAN, and we can close out, and then we can move on from this point. I don't think that we can add any more this evening to what the leader has already said.

A lot of times we can talk about what the leadership said they would do, but when you have the leader of our caucus, the leader of the House Democrats, hopefully the future Speaker of this House of Representatives, she has said on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, not for the first time, second time, third time or fourth time, but tonight of what we would do if given the opportunity.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman, and I want to thank the leader again because I think you are exactly right. This is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is not a campaign promise on the stump somewhere across America. This is right here with the stenographer taking down the words and making sure this is recorded for posterity.

I think the reason this is possible, Mr. MEEK, the reason that this first 100 hours is possible and why it will happen, is because our leadership has gone to great lengths over the past couple of years to unify our caucus. Never before has the Democratic Caucus been more unified in support of basic legislative initiatives which we can actually move on.

What has happened for years and years is we tend to always talk about what divides us. We come down here and we are critical of the administration, but what we want to do as leaders is figure out what can unite us. Ms. PELOSI has done that not only in this caucus, but also with the Senate, also working with HARRY REID in the Senate and their leadership for a new direction for this country. So it is very important.

I was corrected by a good friend of mine, Mr. MACK from Florida, about the ability of someone to be appointed to this body. No Member can be appointed, but the general membership can appoint a Speaker, and the Speaker doesn't necessarily have to be a Member of this body, so I am told. And so someone can be appointed to this body to oversee it.

Now, someone on the other side should think about maybe looking at that and taking advantage of it. But I know when we get elected and we take over this Congress, I know it is going to be Ms. PELOSI who is going to be our Speaker.

I yield to my friend, and I thank my friend, and I look forward to seeing you next week back here again with all of your skills and rhetoric and commitment.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, let me say this: Since we are getting into the debate of who can be appointed or what have you, I could be a millionaire, but I am not. Let me just say this, and I didn't stay in a Holiday Inn Express last night, either. But let me just say this. As we continue on with the 30-somethings coming to a close, as we wait on our Republican colleague to come get his or her next hour, I just want to say that it is very, very important because this is very serious business. Sometimes here in the 30-something Working Group we spend a number of hours, I must say, Mr. Speaker, a number of hours not only studying before we come to the floor, of sharpening our tools and talking about what we are going to do, how we are going to do it, talk about the history of what we have done in the past, and talking about the legislation that is filed in this Congress.

□ 2000

You heard Leader PELOSI. She said we have a minimum wage increase for the American workers at \$7.25 already filed. It is not some saying, well, if we could or we are dreaming of a piece of legislation. It is already there. So when we talk about the first 100 hours to the Republican majority and to the American people, this is not something that we have to say, well, wait one second, wait one minute, we have to draw up some plans. They are already there. They are already there because the American people have said that they want it, overwhelmingly.

And at the same time we talk about real security and securing America. It is not something where we are going to come up with some plan or some gimmick. It is already there. Taking the recommendations, you heard the leader, in the first 100 hours, the Democratic majority, the 10 uninitiated 9/11 recommendations that are vital to securing this country will be implemented.

Like I said, as the ranking member of the Oversight Subcommittee of the Homeland Security Committee here in this House, Mr. Speaker, I have seen the schemes that have been brought about, that we are going to monitor the border and what have you. The American people want something more than monitoring. They want to secure the border, whether it be south or north. They want to secure it, not just monitor it.

So let's just say, for instance, Mr. Speaker, that this new \$2.5 billion initiative to monitor the border actually works. And the reality, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the President, years after the 9/11 Commission report has been sent to the Congress and went to Barnes and Noble and Amazon.com and folks have copies of it, two or three

copies of it, read it three times, still sends his budget to the Hill calling for 250 Border Patrol agents. If the Democratic amendments were adopted, Mr. Speaker, we would have over 6,000 new Border Patrol agents at 2,000 Border Patrol a year, as the 9/11 Commission called for. It was not that we went to the Democratic caucus and said, hey, let's just come up with a number of what we think should happen. We took the bipartisan recommendation from the 9/11 Commission.

So like I said, the leader has already laid the foundation. The leader has come to the floor here in the p.m., a little bit before 8 p.m. eastern standard time, to deliver the message on behalf of the Democrats in this House that have the will and the desire to lead and said what we would do in the first 100 hours.

So now that I know that our Republican colleague is here now, Mr. RYAN, I know that you were going to give the information out.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. As you were talking, and we have all reviewed the Constitution, one of the things I found very interesting as I was reading this is the very beginning, the "We the people" paragraph. "... in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility," and then this last little phrase here hit me: "provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare." The general welfare. Not the special interest groups, not the oil companies, not the energy companies, not the pharmaceutical companies, but the general welfare, Mr. Speaker.

And that is what we are here to do is provide for the general welfare. And I think next year in January, when we agree as a caucus to elect a Member of this Chamber, an elected Member in Ms. PELOSI, we can move in that direction, our constitutional obligation to provide for the general welfare.

www.HouseDemocrats.gov/30something. All of the charts and the rubber stamp and everything are on the Web site for people to access. HouseDemocrats.gov/30something.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we would like to thank the Democratic leadership for allowing us to have this hour. We would also like to share with not only the Members but the American people that it was an honor to address the House this evening, sir.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO COMMIT, THREATEN TO COMMIT, OR SUPPORT TERRORISM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109-135)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of California) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Inter-

national relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2006. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the *Federal Register* on September 22, 2005 (70 FR 55703).

The crisis constituted by the grave acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism committed by foreign terrorists, including the terrorist attacks in New York, in Pennsylvania, and against the Pentagon of September 11, 2001, and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on United States nationals or the United States that led to the declaration of a national emergency on September 23, 2001, has not been resolved. These actions pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism, and maintain in force the comprehensive sanctions to repond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 21, 2006.

THE DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN THE REPUBLICANS AND THE DEMOCRATS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to be recognized on the floor of the United States Congress again and the opportunity to share some of my thoughts and hopefully enlighten some folks as they listen in on our conversation here tonight, Mr. Speaker.

But as I listen to the previous conversation here on the floor, generally that will help or redirect the things I am about to say as I get down here, and perhaps I could just take a few of them from the bottom back towards the top.

One of the things I would point out as a distinction from my esteemed colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I especially appreciate their continuing their dialogue here until such time as I arrived, but one of the things that was repeated over and over again